

## REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending and rejected in the present application. Claims 10-26 and 28-29 are canceled hereby, claims 1-3, 27 and 31 are amended hereby; and claims 32-50 are added hereby.

Responsive to the objection to the specification, paragraphs [0010] and [0045] of the specification have been amended; and claim 19 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification is now in allowable form.

Responsive to the objection to claims 1, 16, 18 and 28, claim 1 has been amended and claims 16, 18 and 28 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is now in allowable form.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 1, 16 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended claim 1 and have canceled claims 16 and 28. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is now in allowable form.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 21-24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0021859 (Willian), Applicants have canceled claims 21-24 and have amended claim 27 to include the subject matter of claim 29. Claim 29 was rejected as being unpatentable over Willian and U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0218451 (Said et al.). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Said does not qualify as prior art. Specifically, Said does not qualify under 35 USC 102(a) because the inventive entity of Said is identical to that of the present application. Moreover, it is logically impossible for a publication by the same inventors to have occurred before the invention of what was published. Nor does Said qualify under 35 USC 102(b) because the Said publication date of Nov. 4, 2004 is not even a year before the present application's PCT filing date of Nov. 18, 2004 (see 35 USC 363), let alone the

present application's provisional filing date of Nov. 18, 2003. Nor does Said qualify under 35 USC 102(e) because the Said reference is not "by another" since the inventive entities are identical, i.e., Schleppenbach and Said.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 27 and claim 30 depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,912,529 (Kolfman) in view of US Patent No. 6,725,424 (Schwerdtfeger), Applicants have canceled claims 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18 and 19 and have amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 11. Claim 11 was rejected as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger and further in view of Said. However, for all of the reasons discussed above, Said does not qualify as prior art.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1, and claims 2, 4 and 5 depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 3 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of Willian, Applicants have canceled claim 20 and point out that claim 3 depends from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 3 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of US Patent No. 6,925,595 (Whitledge), Applicants point out that claim 6 depends from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 6 is also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of US Patent No. 7,065,483 (Decary), Applicants point out that claims 7-9 depend from claim 1, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Accordingly, claims 7-9 are also in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Responsive to the rejection of claims 11, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolfman and Schwerdtfeger in view of Said, Applicants have canceled claims 15 and 17, and have included the subject matter of claim 11 in claim 1 as amended, which is now in condition for allowance for the reasons given above.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 25 as being unpatentable over Willian, Applicants have canceled claim 25.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 26 as being unpatentable over Willian in view of Kolfman, Applicants have canceled claim 26.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 28 as being unpatentable over Willian in view of Kolfman, Applicants have canceled claim 28.

Responsive to the rejection of claim 29-31 as being unpatentable over Willian in view of Said, Applicants have included the subject matter of claim 29 in claim 27, as amended, which is now in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Applicants point out that claim 30 depends from claim 27, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Accordingly, claim 30 is also in condition for allowance. Finally, Applicants have rewritten claim 31 in independent form, and point out that Said is not qualified prior art for the reasons given above with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, claim 31 is now in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 32 has been added to further protect the patentable subject matter of the present invention. Claim 32 recites “enabling the person to use the toolbar to change a reading rate at which speech is generated.” (Emphasis added). Such subject matter is disclosed at paragraph [0066] of the present specification.

Claims 33-50 have been added to further protect the patentable subject matter of the present invention. Paragraphs [0050] and [0062] of the present specification provide support for at least some of these claims.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants believe, in view of the amendments and remarks herein, that all grounds of rejection of the claims have been addressed and overcome, and that all still pending claims are in condition for allowance.

In the event any issue(s) remain that could be resolved by telephone, the undersigned invites the Examiner to contact him to expedite the examination of this application. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

/Keith J. Swedo/

*April 29, 2009*

Keith J. Swedo, Reg. No. 43,176  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
One Indiana Square  
Suite 3500  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2023  
Phone: (317) 713-3500  
Fax: (317) 713-3699